



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

—*Held*, that an instruction which permitted the jury, in estimating plaintiff's damages, to consider humiliation resulting from the loss of an eye, was not erroneous.

Humiliation as an element in estimating damages can only be taken into consideration when there is actual physical injury. *Newport News & M. V. Co. v. Gholson*, 10 Ky. L. R. 938; *Pullman Co. v. Kelly*, 86 Miss. 87. And this suffering from such humiliation must be inseparable from the injuries sustained. *Weston Brewing Co. v. Meredith*, 166 Ill. 306; *McDermott v. Severe*, 202 U. S. 600; *Sherwood v. Chicago & W. M. Ry. Co.*, 82 Mich. 374. But the taking into consideration of the humiliation caused by a defective physical condition has been held objectionable in assessing damages. *Cullen v. Higgins*, 216 Ill. 78. Because mortification and distress of mind caused by a physical defect is too remote to constitute an element of damages. *Southern Pac. Co. v. Hetzer*, 135 Fed. 272.

DIVORCE—EFFECT—SUPPORT OF CHILD.—*STATE V. SEGHERS*, 49 So. 998 (La.).—*Held*, a father's obligation to support his child is not dissolved by a divorce, and the assignment of the custody of the child to the wife does not relieve him from his duty.

The general rule is that after divorce it is the duty of the husband to support the children of the marriage. *Thomas v. Thomas*, 41 Wis. 229; *Courtwright v. Courtwright*, 40 Mich. 633. And where the decree contains no provision for their support, the court has the power to make an order directing the father to provide for them. *Washburn v. Catlin*, 97 N. Y. 623. The wife may even pledge the father's credit for necessities furnished to a child in her custody, for which the father would be liable. *Gilley v. Gilley*, 79 Me. 292. On the contrary it has been held that no liability devolves upon the former husband for the support of the children where the judgment imposes none. *Hampton v. Allee*, 56 Kan. 461; *Finch v. Finch*, 22 Conn. 411. And the wife can at most sue him for contribution. *Pawling v. Willson*, 13 Johns (N. Y.) 192.

ELECTIONS—USE OF VOTING MACHINES—CONSTITUTIONALITY.—*STATE EX REL. KARLINGER V. BOARD OF DEPUTY STATE SUP'RS. OF ELECTIONS*, 89 N. E. 33 (OHIO).—*Held*, that an act providing for the use of voting machines at elections is void, because repugnant to that article of the state constitution which ordains that "all elections shall be by ballot." Crew and Davis, J.J., *dissenting*.

In re Voting Machines, 19 R. I. 728, which appears to have been the first case to decide the question as to the right to use a voting machine under a constitutional provision for voting by ballot, was decided in the affirmative. The question seems to hinge on whether a vote given or cast by a voting machine, is a vote "given by ballot" within the intendment of a constitution to that effect. *City of Detroit v. Board of Inspectors of Election*, 139 Mich. 548. So long as an absolutely certain meaning is not opposed in interpreting a constitution an adherence to its strict rules may be disregarded. *Temple v. Mead*, 4 Vt. 540. And the courts with entire